

Group 1: Claims 14-16, drawn to a semiconductor package, and

Group 2: Claims 17-22, drawn to a method of making the package.

Applicants traverse the restriction requirement because the inventions are not independent and distinct. The Examiner believes the claims in the two Groups are distinct from each other because the package in Group 1 can be made by another materially different process other than Group 2. Applicants disagree. More specifically, the Examiner contends that the package in Group 1 can be made without singulating the plurality of package sites. While the Examiner is technically correct about forming the package stated in claim 14 of Group 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner is reading limitations into Applicants' claims, especially claims 17-19, which is improper. Only dependent claims 20-22 of Group 2 include singulating, hence, independent claim 17 and dependent claims 18-19 of Group 2 do not recite or require singulating. The package of Group 1 in claim 14 cannot be made by a materially different process than that stated in claim 17 of Group 1. The Examiner has failed to provide an example to the contrary. Therefore, the basis for the restriction is improper and reversal is requested.

If the restriction requirement is not withdrawn, Applicants elect to prosecute the invention of Group 2 (claims 17-22) with traverse. Applicants earnestly solicit allowance of the pending claims. Please contact the Applicants' attorney below in regards to this communication or any other issues with the application.

Although Applicants believe no fees are due with this communication, please charge any fees associated herewith, if necessary, to deposit account 13-4773.


SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: 23125

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Patricia S. Goddard
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 35,160
Telephone: 512.996.6839
Fax No.: (512) 996-6854